

## Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires

### Data and Metrics for Policy Making WG update: GNSO session Saturday 20 June 2015

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/calendar/#fjun> The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

(David): And we welcome Jonathan Zook who is going to tell us about - speak to us about data and metrics for Policymaking Workgroup update.

Jonathan Zook: Good afternoon. Thanks for having me to the party here. And since all anybody wants to talk about these days is accountability I thought I would say that this is an accountability session workgroup that we're working on.

And because one of the questions that keeps coming up in the accountability process is what about the accountability of the community?

And, you know, one aspect of accountability of the community would probably be accountability to reality. And I think that that is sort of the work of the Data Metrics and Policymaking Working Group.

So I'll just say next slide. Is somebody on this slide? Is that how it works? All right thanks. So we can make our way through the template here to the next slide, next slide. There we go.

So the Data Metrics and Policymaking Working Group is trying to review methodologies for better incorporating data into the policy development process.

So it's a number of different stages where that data could be made available and made use of.

One is that the issue report level to help define the nature of the issue that we discussed by the workgroup and to figure out if there's even enough of a problem to justify a workgroup.

And then once a workgroup has convened refined that problem analysis and then define the solution potentially wherever possible as a metric.

So, you know, what - here's where the situation is now this is what we'd like it to be. And then another piece of this is a review of the recommendations once implemented some time out to see whether or not they actually accomplished what they were designed to accomplish. So that's sort of what we're up to in the DMPM Working Group.

We've also been guinea pigs for a new workgroup management tool called (Cobbe) Workspace.

I'm going to let Berry actually talk a little bit about what it's been like working with that.

Berry Cobb: Thank you Jonathan. Berry Cobb for the record.

Yes so since Singapore's staff has initiated a pilot program that as Jonathan mentioned called (Cobbe) Workspace.

And this is a tool that is designed pretty much around for the same environment in how we develop policy today.

Now there's many other not-for-profit that use this particular toolset. I think I only spend just a minute on this and I doubt very many of you have heard about what's going on here.

But about a year ago staff initiated a process internally for the management of working groups.

Most of you that participate in working groups and policy process, you know, you kind of see just the surface of what goes on behind the scenes through calendaring and scheduling.

But mostly the Secretariat Team does a lot of work behind the scenes to make sure that everything is in working order.

One of the components is calendaring and scheduling that you see through your email inbox of when groups are scheduled.

But there's also another important component which gets into the attendance taking and some other aspects for setting up those working groups.

So staff had put together a set of requirements to try to help centralize and automate a lot of that. The end vision is really at some point in time depending on whatever toolset is chosen that through icann.org the community will have a single interface to seek out and sign up and participate on working groups.

Right now it's pretty more or less performed through email which you notify the GNSO Secretariat that you're interested in joining a group.

Then there's a few email exchanges going back in terms of updating your SOI or creating a new one which is again a very decentralized toolset. So the end vision would be that on icann.org there's a single place to sign up.

The community will have access to create their profile, update their SOI there and then seek out a particular group that they're interested in.

Once they sign up for that particular group it will help notify and automate behind the scenes with the GNSO Secretariat Team.

And again this is a more centralized solution. And then the biggest aspect of it is the attendance taking. That's a critical part of the output that groups produce.

There is a second component to the (Cobbe) Workspace. It wasn't necessarily part of our original requirement. But this tool does have some interesting document sharing and collaboration components that we're also exploring.

Again our primary mission is for the management of the Working Group. But in terms of how the groups develop documents through, you know, various revisions mostly performed through email and staff usually acts as the authority in terms of bringing in all the various changes and maintaining a single document that is then again redistributed out into the through the email system to the group until a point, one point time when the final report is completed and submitted to the council.

So we are looking and reviewing through some of those features in the (Cobbe) Workspace as well that seems to have some interesting version control but there are a few elements that are lacking.

In terms of the pilot itself we'll probably - we will continue this up until the DMPM groups submits its initial report for public comment and then we will assess whether we - the pilot should continue.

We at this point we do not share whether this is a go forward kind of tool because there are some overall integration issues that could be challenging should this particular tool be used.

But it is very intriguing what's there. And worst-case it's at least a feature development should a different tool be looked at or to develop in-house. So thank you Jonathan. I will turn it back to you.

Jonathan Zook: It's been fun being a guinea pig for (Cobbe) and we've had decent experience using it and for invitations and calendaring and things like that. Next slide.

So in terms of the opportunities for data and policy development we want to kind of improve the way the consensus policies are developed and ensure that the most critical registrant registry and registrar issues are addressed.

So that's again this idea of scoping the problem using data. Of all the culture to veteran form fact-based policy development in this decision-making move away from anecdotes wherever possible towards data wherever available.

And base deliberations and decisions on tangible evidence as opposed to gut feeling or anecdotal evidence and feel a notion of continuous improvement in the policy process and effect this consensus policy implementation.

So again the idea there being that put a policy in place and then actually check in on it a year later to see whether not the recommendations had the desired outcome. Next slide. And next slide, thanks.

Okay so as far as our progress what we did before was evaluate a number of previous PDP and non-PDP efforts to look at how the use of data might have improved the process and the recommendations that were made.

And then we developed a draft framework for metrics request form to make it easy for a Workgroup to request data either from ICANN third parties and/or contracted parties.

Currently we're refining the data metrics framework. We're also reviewing the existing GNSO work product templates like charters, issue reports and final reports for possible enhancements.

So the existing templates we're trying to modify them so that they can incorporate the use of data at every stage along the way.

We're forming relating draft recommendations and we intend to create an initial report and conduct public comment in about a month. And next slide.

So just a little bit about a definition because these words get thrown around a lot, data, the individual facts or the underlying set of values or statistics and the metrics is a kind of measurement of data.

So, you know, complaints per month or something if you're talking about compliance, et cetera, so that when you're setting goals is just sort of where the metrics fall into. Next slide.

So here are our general recommendations in draft form where we are today. Recommendation 1 is we're going to initiate a pilot program to make tactical based data and metric requests within the GNSO to enhance issue development of policy issues.

So we're going to try to kind of pilot program to try these new templates, et cetera. And then the next step beyond that is actually a little bit of a bake sale to request the community budget to make funds available.

Because oftentimes the data that's necessary for the workgroups cost money whether it's because it's available from a third party or because it's available

from a contracted party but something needs to happen to the data. It needs to be processed or anonymized or something like that.

And rather than burden the contracted party with that cost we want to try to put a budget in place for the community to use on an as needed basis to make use of data in their deliberations.

Recommendation 3, we're going to update the Working Group guidelines within the GNSO procedures where necessary to document the DMPM deliverables.

The staff are going to create formal templates for the issue report charter and final reports and document according to the workgroup results in the Workgroup Guidebook.

The Recommendation 5 update the charter and final report templates with the recommendation to measure effectiveness of future consensus recommendations post implementation so again building in this idea of checking back.

And finally Recommendation 6, important metrics request decision tree and form into the workgroup guidelines.

I can stop there. So that might be the place that people have questions. But so pretty straightforward what it is that we're ultimately recommending I think.

Any questions? All right next slide.

This is our timeline. We're in the final stages of putting his recommendations together and these draft templates and so we go to have recommendations and some templates to make available in July to put out for public comment, hopefully review the public comment and produce a final report in August and submit it to all of you in September.

So that's where we are right now. We've been working on this diligently in the shadows of accountability and IANA transition.

But we're very excited about what's going on and about the potential that it has for improving the work group process.

And that's really it, any questions or comments or on any of that? Yes?

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you, Stephanie Perrin for the record. I want to apologize in advance because it sounds like I'm being critical.

My experience in evaluating data and particularly economic data is kind of based on observing what consumer groups go through in our Canadian CRTC hearings where sometimes they can't even hire a telecom economist in Canada because they've all been put on retainer by the industry.

And the facts while they're facts there is a way of getting at the facts that might indicate bias.

So how are you going to control bias in terms of bringing these - I'm all for facts, don't get me wrong. But how do you control for this bias in the ICANN community in the ICANN environment?

Jonathan Zook: Well I mean obviously we're engaged in a fairly generic contemplation process in this workgroup and we went back and looked at some past PPDs, et cetera.

And we're not doing complex regression analysis on the data in most instances but looking for ways to measure the problem that's being discussed by the workgroup.



And so I mean, you know, more often than not I think the data is a more simplified form than may be what you're describing.

I think bias has a way of introducing itself into the analysis of data more so than in the data itself.

So obviously there will be instances in having to decide. The workgroup will have to decide with the most valuable data is for evaluating the problem at hand.

But it's the examples we looked at the past it wasn't terribly complex data. And if the workgroup, the other interpretive part if you will, the non, the more subjective part of this is deciding that something is good or bad.

But measuring it is - it didn't appear to have a bias problem in the case studies that we went through initially. That wasn't a big factor because it was fairly simple data.

Stephanie Perrin: Well I just point out as one example there was a fairly heated discussion last year about going out for - and it was a report on the use of privacy proxy services for criminal activity or bogus activity.

Jonathan Zook: Sure.

Stephanie Perrin: You know, sometimes things are interpreted as being inaccurate where it's just somebody forgetting, you know?

So that's the kind of thing that...

Jonathan Zook: And we didn't endeavor to kind of control the thought process of workgroup in that regard. That is going to be the heavy lifting of the workgroup is to actually look at data and decide whether it represents a positive indicator for the problem being assessed right? So that's sort of what you're describing.

Stephanie Perrin: Yes.

Jonathan Zook: But the - but more often than not workgroups operate just completely in the absence of data with everyone theorizing about what the problem is. And I think we're trying to make an incremental improvement over that.

Stephanie Perrin: Thank you.

(David): We're running over time so we're cutting into our coffee break. So we'll hear from (James) and Michele and if it's okay we'll try and shut the queue after that.

Jonathan Zook: Okay.

(James): Thanks. I'll be brief, (James) speaking for the record. Thank you Jonathan. Thanks Berry for this overview. And then if you could perhaps maybe in, you know, give us the high level overview of the request process. Are you thinking that most of the data will be comprised from public sources or is there some mechanism by which contracted parties or other service providers would be required to provide data to an ongoing PDP or an issues report?

Jonathan Zook: Yes. So we've had some contracted parties participate in the workgroup. And that's obviously an important question.

And there isn't a requirement to participate. It's more a question of trying to get the best data for the workgroup to perform its duties.

So one of the things we did was put together a kind of a flow diagram of how to go about requesting data.

And sometimes it's from ICANN itself. Sometimes it would be from a third party data provider. And sometimes it would be from a - from contracted parties.

And in that flow diagram is a series of questions of, you know, how we use it to give the data? Is the data of a business specific nature and the competitive data? Is there way to anonymize the data? And can we provide funds to the contracted party for that work to get done?

So the idea is to minimize the burden on a contracted party. But I - but we don't have the remit to force anyone to share data.

We were hoping that by making it as efficient, as specific and as economically feasible as possible that there would be a desire to share the data in order to have the best policy outcome.

(James): Thanks. And I would just stipulate that if it were voluntary and some providers gave you data and some providers didn't that that partial data might actually be more or less valuable than no data.

And so I don't know if you're talking about, you know, a big chunk of the market not providing...

Jonathan Zook: I think more often than not it will be the bigger contracted parties that will be able to provide us data, not the smaller ones. I mean I think just the economics of it is - it will be that way.

It's not unfortunately it's not the economic. It's not a question of convenience or capabilities it's - so I'll drop it.

Jonathan Zook: We're going to have to fight those battles on a case by case basis.

(James): Yes. It is very (unintelligible).

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Zook: So what we're trying to do is make it as easy as possible so that the incentives not to provide data will be minimized.

(James): Yes.

(David): Thank you. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Yes and just very briefly first off as you know I've said this to you before I think it's fantastic to push forward so that ICANN is working on policies based around actual data as opposed to my crazy person down the road there who drove me nuts has now forced me into this position type scenarios. It's - which is not good for anybody.

But I would agree with (James). I mean the issue is taking from the registrar perspective something to be aware of depending on the business model of the registrar if you get data from one or two whoever particular business model it'll give you a completely perverted view of reality.

So, you know, taking say Go Daddy yes they have a huge customer base. But they're probably not particularly respect - they're not going to reflect certain markets certain types.

Taking my customer base it's going to reflect something completely different. I have hardly any Asian clients for example.

So, you know, these kinds of things are not going to be easy to deal with. And the issue around providing the data it could be something as simple as a matter of trust because ICANN has as we all know such a stellar record around of information security and has never ever, ever, ever had a data breach of any kind.

So I would feel so confident handing over potentially private data to them.

Jonathan Zook: Certainly Michele. And I appreciate that. And those issues were raised inside the Working Group. And so one of the possible uses of the funds would be for a third-party aggregator that would take and combine the data and then supply that aggregated data to the workgroup rather than the raw data directly from your database.

So again there's an effort to try and minimize these things and as you say a recognition that your data not being part of it or the only part of it hopefully would lead to be an incentive for more to provide data particularly if we were able to provide an aggregator or something so that the security and competitive questions were addressed.

So I mean again I believe I believe these will probably be battles fought on a case by case basis. We're trying to set an expectation that data is used and then find the best way to get at it.

(David): Okay. Thank you Jonathan for that excellent...

Jonathan Zook: My pleasure. The next slide here is or maybe the slide after the next it just says a URL to see more information. So please tune in and looking you can see what we've been working on. Thanks a lot.

(David): Thank you. And that's the end of that item. And it is now time for our coffee break after which Jonathan will resume the chair. So thank you all.

Man: All right we'll call you back in about ten minutes. Thanks everyone.

END

